

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS**

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application.

#### **Listing of Claims:**

Claim 1 (Previously Presented): A method comprising:

prioritizing, with a prioritization engine, events obtained from interrogation of a medical device implanted in a patient, wherein the events include therapy events and diagnostic events, and wherein the prioritization engine is external to the patient; and

presenting, with a user interface device, a list of the events based on the prioritization.

Claim 2 (Original): The method of claim 1, further comprising:

prioritizing events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients; and

presenting a list of the patients and a list of the events for each of the patients based on the prioritization.

Claim 3 (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein prioritizing events includes prioritizing the events based on a relative importance associated with the events.

Claim 4 (Original): The method of claim 1, further comprising invoking a special action in response to an event with a relative importance that exceeds a threshold.

Claim 5 (Original): The method of claim 4, wherein the special action comprises using a conspicuous text format when presenting data from the event.

Claim 6 (Original): The method of claim 5, wherein the conspicuous text format includes one of font, bold text, highlighted text, underlined text, and italicized text.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 7 (Original): The method of claim 4, wherein the special action includes generating an alarm, notifying a clinician, and notifying a patient.

Claim 8 (Previously Presented): A method comprising:

interrogating, with a remote monitor, a medical device implanted in a patient to obtain event data;

receiving, with a prioritization engine, the event data from the remote monitor, wherein the event data describes one of a therapy event and a diagnostic event, and wherein the prioritization engine is external to the patient; and

assigning, with the prioritization engine, a relative importance to each of the events.

Claim 9 (Original): The method of claim 8, further comprising prioritizing events obtained from the interrogation based on the relative importance.

Claim 10 (Original): The method of claim 8, further comprising assigning the relative importance based on a set of rules.

Claim 11 (Original): The method of claim 8, further comprising presenting a prioritized list of the events based on the relative importance.

Claim 12 (Original): The method of claim 8, further comprising:

prioritizing events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients; and

presenting a list of the patients and a prioritized list of the events for each of the patients based on the relative importance.

Claim 13 (Currently Amended): The method of claim 8, further comprising invoking a special action in response to an event with a[[n]] relative importance that exceeds a threshold.

Claim 14 (Original): The method of claim 13, wherein the special action comprises using a conspicuous text format when presenting data from the event.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 15 (Original): The method of claim 14, wherein the conspicuous text format includes one of bold text, highlighted text, underlined text, and italicized text.

Claim 16 (Original): The method of claim 13, wherein the special action includes generating an alarm, notifying a clinician, and notifying a patient.

Claim 17 (Previously Presented): A system comprising:

a prioritization engine to prioritize events obtained from interrogation of a medical device implanted in a patient, wherein the events include therapy events and diagnostic events, and wherein the prioritization engine is external to the patient; and

a user interface device to present a list of the events based on the prioritization.

Claim 18 (Original): The system of claim 17, further comprising a data management application that parses raw data from the implantable medical device, and populates fields of a database with event data.

Claim 19 (Original): The system of claim 18, wherein the event data comprises one of patient name, device type, date event data was parsed, and event type.

Claim 20 (Original): The system of claim 17, further comprising a database to store the prioritized events, wherein the user interface device includes a web browser to access the prioritized events via a network connection.

Claim 21 (Original): The system of claim 20, further comprising a derivation engine to generate additional events based on the stored events.

Claim 22 (Original): The system of claim 17, further comprising a rule engine to assign relative importance to the events based on rules from a rule database.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 23 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the prioritization engine prioritizes events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients, and the user interface presents a list of the patients and a list of the events for each of the patients based on the prioritization.

Claim 24 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the prioritization engine prioritizes the events based on a relative importance associated with the events.

Claim 25 (Original): The system of claim 17, further comprising a notification device to perform a special action in response to an event with relative importance that exceeds a threshold, wherein the relative importance is assigned to the event based on a level of priority for the event.

Claim 26 (Original): The system of claim 25, wherein the special action comprises one of using a conspicuous text format when presenting data from the event.

Claim 27 (Original): The system of claim 26, wherein the conspicuous text format includes one of bold text, highlighted text, underlined text, and italicized text.

Claim 28 (Original): The system of claim 25, wherein the special action includes generating an alarm, notifying a clinician, and notifying a patient.

Claim 29 (Previously Presented): A computer-readable medium comprising instructions for causing a programmable processor to:

prioritize events obtained from interrogation of a medical device implanted in a patient, wherein the events include therapy events and diagnostic events; and

present a list of the events based on the prioritization, wherein the programmable processor is external to the patient.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 30 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 29, wherein the instructions cause the processor to:

prioritize events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients; and

present a list of the patients and a list of the events for each of the patients based on the prioritization.

Claim 31 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 29, wherein the instructions cause the processor to prioritize events based on a relative importance associated with the events.

Claim 32 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 29, wherein the instructions cause the processor to invoke a special action in response to an event with relative importance that exceeds a threshold.

Claim 33 (Previously Presented): A computer-readable medium comprising instructions for causing a programmable processor to:

interrogate a medical device implanted in a patient;

receive event data, wherein the event data describes one of a therapy event and a diagnostic event; and

assign a relative importance to each event, wherein the programmable processor is external to the patient.

Claim 34 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to prioritize events obtained from interrogation based on relative importance.

Claim 35 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to assign the relative importance based on a set of rules.

Claim 36 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to present a list of the events based on the prioritization.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 37 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to:

prioritize events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients; and

present a list of the patients and a prioritized list of the events for each of the patients based on relative importance.

Claim 38 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to invoke a special action in response to an event with a relative importance that exceeds a threshold, wherein the relative importance is assigned to the event based on a level of priority for the event.

Claim 39 (Previously Presented): A device comprising:

a prioritization engine to prioritize events obtained from interrogation of a medical device implanted in a patient, wherein the events include therapy events and diagnostic events, and wherein the prioritization engine is external to the patient; and

a database to store the prioritized events.

Claim 40 (Previously Presented): The device of claim 39, further comprising a data management application that parses raw data from the implantable medical device, and populates fields of the database with event data.

Claim 41 (Previously Presented): The device of claim 39, wherein the event data comprises one of patient name, device type, date event data was parsed, and event type.

Claim 42 (Previously Presented): The device of claim 39, further comprising a derivation engine to generate additional events based on the stored events.

Claim 43 (Previously Presented): The device of claim 39, further comprising a rule engine to assign relative importance to the events based on rules from a rule database, wherein the prioritization engine prioritizes the events based on the relative importance.

Application Number 10/650,497

Amendment in response to Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009

Claim 44 (Currently Amended): The device of claim 39[[17]], wherein the prioritization engine prioritizes events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients.